

1  
2  
3  
4                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
6                   AT SEATTLE

7 M.G. a minor, by and through her parents  
8 J.G. and other, C.G.,

9                   Plaintiff,

10                  v.

11                  SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT,

12                  Defendant.

13                   **CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00663-BAT**

14                   **ORDER DISMISSING CASE  
15 WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

16                  This matter comes before the Court on its own motion. On July 3, 2024, the Court  
17 granted Defendant's motion to modify the briefing schedule. Dkt. 11. Plaintiff did not respond to  
18 the motion. The Court found good cause to grant the motion as Plaintiff's complaint neither  
19 identifies the specific issues to be reviewed nor the grounds upon which Plaintiff contends the  
20 ALJ erred. *Id.* In modifying the briefing schedule, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an opening  
21 brief or motion by August 19, 2024. *Id.*

22                  Plaintiff failed to file an opening brief or request a continuance. Therefore, on August 22,  
23 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure  
20 to comply with the Court's July 3, 2024 Order. The Order to Show Cause stated "Cause will be  
21 shown if Plaintiffs file their opening brief by Monday, August 26, 2024. Dkt. 12. As of the date  
22 of this Order, Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's Order to Show Cause.

23                  Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT  
24 PREJUDICE** for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (allowing for involuntary

1 dismissal for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with the federal rules or court orders);  
2 *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (courts may  
3 dismiss cases *sua sponte* under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute); *Oliva v. Sullivan*, 958 F.2d  
4 272, 274 (9th Cir. 1992) (“The district judge has an obligation to warn the plaintiff that dismissal  
5 is imminent.”); *Villalobos v. Vilsack*, 601 F. App’x 551, 552 (9th Cir. 2015) (upholding district  
6 court’s dismissal without prejudice for failure to prosecute after the plaintiff failed to respond to  
7 the court’s order to show cause).

8 DATED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024.

9  
10   
11 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
United States Magistrate Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23